

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1, 17, 18 and 22 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-34 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 17 and 22 are independent claims.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112***

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as lack of antecedent.

Claim 17 has been amended to resolve the antecedent problem. This amendment is made for the sole purpose of clarifying claim 17. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 17.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1, 15-18, 22 and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,580,408 issued to Bae, *et al.* ("Bae"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended claims 1 and 22 now recites an organic electroluminescent display (OELD), comprising ... a plurality of pixel circuits comprising a first switch, ... wherein one of the first switch is directly connected to the data line and the other end of the first switch is directly connected to any of a source electrode and a drain electrode of the second TFT. None of the cited reference disclose such features. Therefore, claims 1 and 22 are patentable over the cited reference. As consequence, claims 2-16 and 23-34 that are respectively dependent from the claims 1 and 22 are also patentable over the references of record.

The Examiner simply rejected claim 17 as method claim corresponding to the apparatus of claims 1 and 22 and thus for the same reason as applied to claims 1 and 22. Since amended claims 1 and 22 are now patentable over the cited reference, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is also patentable over the cited reference. Likewise, claims 19-21 that are dependent from claim 17 are also patentable over the cited reference.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all the outstanding objections and rejections over claims 1-34 be withdrawn and pass those claims to allowance.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bae in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,229,508 issued to Kane ("Kane"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 19-21 are dependent from the amended claim 17, which is now patentable over Bae. Since the independent claim from which claim 19-21 depends is patentable over the cited reference, the dependent claims are also patentable over the cited reference. Because the claims

are patentable over the primary reference, it is not necessary to discuss on the secondary reference.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that all the rejections and objections over claims 19-21 be withdrawn and pass those claims to allowance.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2-14, 23-30 and 33-34 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 17 and 22 have been amended and are now believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that all the remaining claims are in condition for allowance.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: January 20, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280

\\COM\294915.1